



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,425	11/12/2003	Joseph J. Kubler	14364US11	8617
7590	05/02/2007		EXAMINER ZHU, BO HUI ALVIN	
Christopher C. Winslade McAndrews, Held & Malloy Suite 3400 500 W. Madison Street Chicago, IL 60661			ART UNIT 2616	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/706,425	KUBLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Bo Hui A. Zhu	Art Unit 2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2006.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 22-55 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 22-55 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 12 November 2003 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date . . . .  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 22 – 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerson et al. (US 5,579,487) in view of Morris et al. (US 4,884,132).

(1) with regard to claims 22, 37 and 49:

Meyerson et al. discloses a system and method, comprising: an imaging device (CCD, 160 on Fig. 6; column 9 line 27) for capturing an image; processing circuitry for processing the image (inherent since all CCDs consist of integrated circuitry for processing captured image); a wireless communication interface (RF MOD, 30 on Fig. 1; column 5, lines 58 - 61); a display device for providing feedback to a user (display, 50 on Fig. 1; column 6, lines 34 – 35);

Meyerson et al. does not expressly disclose using the wireless communication interface for transmitting image.

Morris et al. teaches an image being processed and transmitted over a cellular network (column 1, lines 35 - 39).

It would have been desirable to transmit image over a wireless network because it would enable the image to be available to viewers as a remote location and thus greatly increase the productivity of the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method as taught by Morris et al. in the system of Meyerson et al.

(2) with regard to claims 23, 39 and 51:

Meyerson et al. further discloses that the imaging device is a charge coupled device (column 9, line 27).

(3) with regard to claims 24, 40 and 52:

Meyerson et al. further discloses that the image is a one dimensional code or a two dimensional code (column 9, lines 28 – 29).

(4) with regard to claims 25 – 27 and 41 – 42 :

Meyerson et al. further discloses that the image is text, handwriting or a picture (inherent since all charge coupled devices can capture image, and text, handwriting or pictures are all images, and the process in which image is being processed by the CCD is when information in the image being identified).

(5) with regard to claims 28 and 47:

Meyerson et al. discloses all of the subject matter as discussed above but fails to expressly disclose that the wireless communication interface (30; column 5, lines 58 – 60) is used for communication speech.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that the use of speech communication in cellular network is well known in the art. And it would have been desirable to use wireless communication interface for communicating speech because it would enable speech to be available to a remote location, thus increase the productivity of the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to include speech communication into the system of Meyerson et al.

(6) with regard to claims 29 and 46:

Meyerson et al. further discloses that the wireless communication interface is compatible with a cellular network (column 5, lines 58 – 60).

(7) with regard to claim 30:

Meyerson et al. further discloses that the wireless communication interface uses a spread spectrum technique (column 5, lines 58 – 61).

(8) with regard to claims 31 – 33 and 45:

Meyerson et al. discloses all of the subject matter as discussed above but fails to expressly disclose that transmitting the image to a local area network, a packet network, or a TCP/IP network.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that local area network, packet network, and TCP/IP network are all well known in the art. It would have been desirable to transmit image over these networks because it would enable the image to be available to viewers as a remote location, and also is economical incentive since TCP/IP is a widely used technology and using it would eliminate the need for designing a brand new network protocol, make the network easier to be accessible by other networks. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use TCP/IP packet network and local area network in the system of Meyerson et al.

(9) with regard to claims 34, 35, 43, 44, 53 and 54 :

Meyerson et al. further discloses that decoding the image from a first representation to a second representation; and the second representation is a digital representation (inherent since a CCD senses an image of an object, which is the first representation, and turns the captured image into a digital format, which is the second representation of the image).

(10) with regard to claim 36:

Meyerson et al. further discloses that a character recognition process (column 9, line 28, a bar code scanner does character recognition).

(11) with regard to claims 38 and 50:

Meyerson et al. further discloses that the capturing, the processing and the transmitting occurs within the same device (work slate unit, A on Fig. 1).

(12) with regard to claims 48 and 55:

Meyerson et al. further discloses displaying information to a user (column 6, lines 34 – 35).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bo Hui A. Zhu whose telephone number is (571)270-1086. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 10am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571)272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BZ

April 20, 2007



HASSAN KIZOU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600